

Senate Kills Anti-ABM Amendment

By John Maffre
Washington Post Staff Writer

A massive coalition of hawkish Republicans and Democrats yesterday beat down a Senate effort to block deployment of the \$5 billion "thin" Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

The Senate killed, 52 to 34, an anti-ABM amendment offered by John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) and backed by a loose bipartisan alliance including Eugene J. McCarthy (D-Minn.). The Cooper amendment would have dropped from the military construction bill \$227.3 million earmarked for a start of construction on Sentinel system facilities.

Less than half an hour later a similar amendment proposed by Sen. Stephen M. Young (D-

See AEM, A8, Col. 5

Yesterday the ABM foes were clearly outnumbered, and the defeat was worse than expected.

Sources close to Cooper and to Sen. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), co-author of the Amendment, thought they might lose by at most 15 votes.

But many of the stalwarts they might have counted on—Democrats like Frank Church of Idaho, J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, Vance Hartke of Indiana, Albert Gruening of Alaska, and Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut—were in their home states facing the problem of getting re-elected.

The Administration's position was strengthened by a letter last week from Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford.

Clifford in his letter hinted at the need to proceed with Sentinel so the U.S. would have a better bargaining posture with Russia, a point on which he made even more stress last Thursday in his Pentagon press conference.

This line of reasoning, one which the Administration had not notably stressed in the

ABM, From A1

Ohio) was downed by the more crushing vote of 72 to 12.

The two votes virtually assured passage of the \$1.8-billion military construction authorization with its controversial funds to buy sites and begin construction of facilities for the Sentinel system. Supporters of the Sentinel say it is primarily for defense against China but would also provide some protection against Russia.

Finally action will be taken this afternoon on a series of amendments by Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) that would slice 10 per cent or \$180 million from the military construction bill.

In other legislation pending before Congress are a number of requests for funds for Sentinel which, with the \$227.3 million in the construction measure, would total more than \$1.7 billion.

In 1963 the Senate in secret session rejected proposals for an ABM system of defense. One argument was that it was inappropriate in a year that the nuclear test ban treaty was due for signature, and another was that the effectiveness of ABM was an unknown quantity.

Neither the angry opposition of Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) nor the quiet and almost understated arguments of presidential candidate McCarthy apparently made any converts to the opposition.

The atmosphere in the Senate yesterday was a complete reversal of Friday when Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), the bill's floor manager, was on the defensive against an attack led by Cooper and Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

ABM opponents argued that deployment would accelerate the arms race, that the ABM's effectiveness was not yet established and it was therefore foolish to start heavy spending on it in view of budgetary problems.

earlier arguments for ABM, was attacked by McCarthy when he entered the Senate shortly after 3 p.m.

"The decision is a good example, unfortunately not an isolated one," he said, "of an attempt to buy security through misplaced simplistic reliance on technology rather than by facing up more realistically and constructively to problems that are in fact primarily political in nature. In this case, the problems of the relationships between the United States, the Soviet Union, China and other nations of Asia."

The presidential candidate also questioned the Administration's arguments that it would help protect against an accidental discharge of a nuclear weapon against the U.S.

McCarthy stressed that "the massive offensive capability of the United States must certainly continue to be counted as the effective deterrent against many rational decisions by the Chinese to employ any nuclear weapons."

Atomic Energy, Sen. John O. Pastore (Democrat of R.I.). By far the loudest champion of the Administration was the fiery chairman of the Joint Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy, Sen. John O.

"Where is our reason?" Pastore shouted three times, pounding the lectern before him or the desk top of any neighboring Senator as he roamed around the chamber. "We shed crocodile tears that if we protect American lives we are accelerating the arms race."

Then he paused, and repeated twice dramatically "Oh, woe be to us!"

"I'm ashamed if that's the philosophy of America," he said, noting that there was a readiness to pour funds into Vietnam but none for protection here.